

Chan, Suilin

From: Petriman, Viorica
Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2019 4:23 PM
To: 'Potter, Benjamin J (DEC)'
Cc: 'Prunier, Denise (DEC)'; Chan, Suilin; Cronin, Michael P (DEC)
Subject: RE: Norlite permit change requests.

Hi Ben,

Thank you for the summary of the yesterday's call. I think I may have something to add to make it clearer what revisions would be needed in order for the permit to comply with all CAA requirements, and, also, to reflect other portions of the call. My additions are in red.

Please let me know if you have any questions about this email.

Viorica Petriman
Environmental Engineer
US EPA–Region 2
Air & Radiation Division
Permitting Section
212-637-4021

Denise

The meeting with Viorica went well yesterday. The requested fixes are not overwhelming, I have summarized them below. EPA willing to let the permit be issued as long as DEC makes the following changes that were requested.

EPA would also want to receive an email as soon as possible from DEC R4 stating that all of the revisions and/or updates discussed during the 5/22/2019 call would be implemented in the permit prior to finalizing it;
DEC offered to provide EPA an opportunity to briefly review the updated permit and PRR, before June 10, 2019 (the end of the EPA 45-day review period);

1. All Non-SIP approved rules (6 NYCRR 212) need to be moved to the state side of the permit. Mark L. has a list I can get to you.
2. All SIP approved 212 conditions (even from old mods) need to be on Federal side of the permit
3. Conditions #25 132,135,133, and 136 of the 1/1/2016 issued title V permit (which is being modified by the proposed title V permit), which cites to the SIP-approved Part 212 and are labeled "applicable federal requirements" should be re-instated in the proposed title V permit. Conditions 133 and 136 establish a NOx RACT emission limit of 61 lb/hr for each of the 2 kilns; However, these NOx RACT limits were not submitted to EPA for approval as a source-specific SIP revisions in accordance with 212.10(c)(3), thus these 2 conditions

should in fact be marked as “applicable state requirements” as opposed to “applicable federal requirements”. Nevertheless, we recommend revising these 2 conditions by adding language agreed upon by DEC and EPA for cases when RACT limits have not yet been approved by EPA as source-specific SIP revisions (Please ask Bob S. about it) and keep the 2 conditions as “applicable federal requirements”.

~~are on the federal side of the permit even though they have not been approved by EPA. EPA will allow them to stay on the federal side as long as there is language added stating that upon EPA approval of these permit conditions, they become federally enforceable. Adding this language in the Project description should be acceptable.~~

Proposed Permit issues

4. Conditions 5-42, 5-53, 5-43, 5-54, 5-44, 5-55, 6-17 and 6-19 should be moved to the stated side of the permit. In the PRR project description or condition description in the PRR EPA wants us to write justification and reason for emission limits. (We suggest that such justification discusses that the Part 212 to which those conditions cite was not yet approved into the SIP by EPA, and, also, explains what is the connection between the installation of the dry scrubber and establishing lower NOx and SO2 limits)
5. Condition 6-1 EPA wants this moved to the state side of the permit and a description in the PRR discussing the basis of extension and basis of rule. One reason for the extension is because we are building something new and it should be based on that.
6. Condition 6-21 should be on the federal side of the permit. Steve already took care of this. There are more clarifications about Condition 6-21 in the email I just sent Denise.
7. EEE Conditions Denise is handling this explanation and any issues directly with Viorica.
8. For the new NOx limits we should add verbiage about EPA approval they want the calculations associated with these limits. [It's not completely clear to me what this means here] I realize these are based on testing and then 8760 hours of operation to determine Major/non-major status and PEP for this project. Some additional verbiage in the PRR describing just that should be sufficient.

If I did not get any of this correct Viorica will edit and get back to you. If you want me to do any part of this to help you out, just tell me which parts, and I'll get on it.

Thanks

From: Potter, Benjamin J (DEC) <benjamin.potter@dec.ny.gov>
Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2019 11:05 AM
To: Prunier, Denise (DEC) <denise.prunier@dec.ny.gov>
Cc: McPherson, Gary J (DEC) <gary.mcpherson@dec.ny.gov>; Cronin, Michael P (DEC) <michael.cronin@dec.ny.gov>; Kornak, Kate F (DEC) <Kate.Kornak@dec.ny.gov>; Petriman, Viorica <Petriman.Viorica@epa.gov>
Subject: Norlite permit change requests.

Denise

The meeting with Viorica went well yesterday. The requested fixes are not overwhelming, I have summarized them below. EPA willing to let the permit be issued as long as DEC makes the following changes that were requested.

1. All Non-SIP approved rules (6 NYCRR 212) need to be moved to the state side of the permit. Mark L. has a list I can get to you.
2. All SIP approved 212 conditions (even from old mods) need to be on Federal side of the permit
3. Conditions #132,135,133, and 136 are on the federal side of the permit even though they have not been approved by EPA. EPA will allow them to stay on the federal side as long as there is language added stating that

upon EPA approval of these permit conditions, they become federally enforceable. Adding this language in the Project description should be acceptable.

Proposed Permit issues

4. Conditions 6-17 and 6-19 should be moved to the stated side of the permit. In the PRR project description or condition description in the PRR EPA wants us to write justification and reason for emission limits.
5. Condition 6-1 EPA wants this moved to the state side of the permit and a description in the PRR discussing the basis of extension and basis of rule. One reason for the extension is because we are building something new and it should be based on that.
6. Condition 6-21 should be on the federal side of the permit. Steve already took care of this.
7. EEE Conditions Denise is handling this explanation and any issues directly with Viorica.
8. For the new NOx limits we should add verbiage about EPA approval they want the calculations associated with these limits. I realize these are based on testing and then 8760 hours of operation to determine Major/non-major status and PEP for this project. Some additional verbiage in the PRR describing just that should be sufficient.

If I did not get any of this correct Viorica will edit and get back to you. If you want me to do any part of this to help you out, just tell me which parts, and I'll get on it.

Thanks

Ben